

## REMARKS

### 1. Introduction

In the Office Action mailed December 10, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connor, U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0002339 ("O'Connor") in view of Plaschke et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,023,622 ("Plaschke").

The Examiner rejected claims 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connor in view of Plaschke and Choi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,724,740 ("Choi").

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connor in view of Plaschke and Nee et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,876,857 ("Nee").

The Examiner rejected claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Connor, in view of Plaschke and Choi, and further in view of Nee.

The Examiner rejected claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto, Jr., et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,002,918 ("Prieto") in view of Yahagi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,428,817 ("Yahagi").

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Prieto in view of Yahagi and Choi.

The Examiner indicated that claims 6 and 14 contain allowable subject matter but objected to these claims as being dependent upon rejected base claims.

In response, Applicants have (i) canceled claims 6, 14, and 16-19, (ii) amended claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 15, and 20-24, and (iii) added new claims 25 and 26.

For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the application, as amended herein.

## 2. Response to Claim Rejections

The Examiner indicated that claims 6 and 14 (now canceled) contain allowable subject matter. Those claims recited, *inter alia*, a “first bandwidth allocation algorithm” used for “mobile stations within a first group of mobile stations” and a “second bandwidth allocation algorithm” used for “mobile stations within a second group of mobile stations.” In this Response, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9, and 20 to similarly recite “a first bandwidth allocation algorithm” that is used for a “first group” of mobile stations and a “second bandwidth allocation algorithm” that is used for a “second group” of mobile stations. Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 9, and 20 (and their dependent claims) are clearly allowable.

## 3. Conclusion

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at any time at (312) 913-0001.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 8, 2010

By:

Richard A. Machonkin

Richard A. Machonkin  
Reg. No. 41,962